



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO		
10/058,494	01/24/2002	Noam Livnat	2000.129000/TT5979	2284	
23720 7590 12/19/2006 WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100			EXAMINER GOLD, AVI M		
			2157		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	12/19/2006	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		A = 1! = -4!	N-				
Office Action Summary		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/058,4	94	LIVNAT ET AL.			
		Examine	7	Art Unit			
		Avi Gold		2157			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and prefind for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per cure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by start reply received by the Office later than three months after the material part of terms adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no ev . reply within the star riod will apply and w atute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tin tutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from blication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. 8 133)			
Status				,			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	1 November 2	006.				
	a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
3)							
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4)						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) <u></u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Buresee the attached detailed Office action for a least section for a	ents have bee ents have bee priority docume reau (PCT Rul	en received. In received in Applicati ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen			_				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-15 Other:							

Art Unit: 2157

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 21, 2006. Claim 7 was amended. Claim 8 was cancelled. Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ishii, U.S. Patent No. 6,594,505, further in view of Farazmandnia et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,625,472.

Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a mobile telephone system capable of coping with a variety of mobile radio telephone systems by a single mobile radio telephone (see abstract).

Regarding claim 1, Ishii teaches a method for delivering a communication protocol to an electronic device, comprising:

a first electronic device having a first communication protocol to a second device having a plurality of communication protocols, the plurality of communication protocols

Art Unit: 2157

including the first communication protocol and a second communication protocol (col. 2, lines 27-51, Ishii discloses mobile radio telephones with mobile base stations connected to one another with possible different communication protocols);

establishing communication between the first and second devices using the first communication protocol (col. 2, lines 39-42, Ishii discloses mobile radio telephone communication over a protocol);

transferring the second communication protocol from the second device to the first device (col. 2, lines 43-48, Ishii discloses downloading of a protocol software from one base station to the other);

installing the second communication protocol on the first device; and switching to the second communication protocol for further communication (col. 2, lines 43-51, Ishii discloses executed communication on the new protocol after the download is completed).

Ishii fails to teach the limitation further including the physically attaching the devices.

However, Farazmandnia teaches a system and method for connecting a cellular telephone to a personal computer system through a universal serial bus port (see abstract). Farazmandnia teaches the use of connecting a cellular telephone to a personal computing device (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ishii in view of Farazmandnia to physically attach devices. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for a direct connection.

Art Unit: 2157

Regarding claim 2, Ishii teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second communication protocol are software communication protocols (col. 2, lines 43-48).

Regarding claim 3, Ishii teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second electronic devices are handheld devices (col. 2, lines 27-51).

Regarding claim 4, Ishii teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the established communication is point-to-point communication (col. 2, lines 27-51).

Regarding claim 5, Ishii teaches a method for exchanging data between electronic devices, comprising:

a first electronic device having a first communication protocol to a second device having a plurality of communication protocols, the plurality of communication protocols including the first communication protocol and a second communication protocol;

determining that the second communication protocol is not installed on the second device;

based on this determination, selecting the first communication protocol from the plurality of communication protocols; and

establishing communication between the first and second devices using the first communication protocol (col. 2, lines 27-51).

Art Unit: 2157

Ishii fails to teach the limitation further including the physically attaching the devices.

However, Farazmandnia teaches the use of connecting a cellular telephone to a personal computing device (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ishii in view of Farazmandnia to physically attach devices. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for a direct connection.

Regarding claim 6, Ishii teaches the method of claim 5 further comprising:
transferring the second communication protocol from the second device to the first device;

installing the second communication protocol on the first device; and switching to the second communication protocol for further communication (col. 2, lines 27-51).

Regarding claim 7, Ishii teaches an apparatus for delivering data to a handheld electronic device, the apparatus comprising:

non-volatile storage for storing a plurality of communication protocols including a first communication protocol and a second communication protocol; and

a processor configured to:

establish communication with the handheld device using the first communication protocol; transfer the second communication protocol to the handheld device;

Art Unit: 2157

install the second communication protocol on the handheld device; and switch to the second communication protocol for further communication with the handheld device (col. 2, lines 27-51).

Ishii fails to teach the limitation further including an electrical connector physically coupling the apparatus to the handheld device and transferring and installing a protocol via the electrical connector.

However, Farazmandnia teaches the use of connecting a cellular telephone to a personal computing device (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ishii in view of Farazmandnia to use an electrical connector to physically couple the apparatus to the handheld device and transferring and installing a protocol via the electrical connector. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for a direct connection.

Regarding claim 9, Ishii teaches the apparatus of claim 7 wherein the first and second communication protocol are software communication protocols (col. 2, lines 43-48).

Regarding claim 10, Ishii teaches the apparatus of claim 7 wherein the established communication is point-to-point communication (col. 2, lines 27-51).

Art Unit: 2157

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,690 to Weiman
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,349,649 to lijima
 - U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,815 to Willis, Jr. et al.
 - U.S. Pat. No. 6,098,138 to Martinelli et al.
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,696,903 to Mahany
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,287,541 to Davis et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avi Gold whose telephone number is 571-272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG

ARIO/ETIENNE
SUPERVISCOSY PATENT EXAMINER